

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-22 were pending in this application. Claims 1, 10 and 17 have been amended and new claims 23-25 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-25 will be pending upon entry of this Amendment. Claims 1, 10, and 17 are independent claims. Support for the amendment to each of the claims can be found, for example, at paragraphs [0034] and [0035] of the present application. For the reasons stated below, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, claims 1-11, 17, 21-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,862,464 to Son ("Son"). Claims 12-16 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Son in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,549 to Riedl ("Riedl"). To the extent these grounds for rejection might still be applied to claims presently pending in this application, they are respectfully traversed.

As amended, claim 1 recites, among other things, a voltage status control circuit that comprises a first means for preventing power from flowing from the power supply of the base unit to the portable unit that is disposed within the cradle when the voltage level of the power supply of the base unit is lower than the predetermined level, and a second means for disabling the first means when the voltage level of the power supply of the base unit is higher than the predetermined level so that the power can flow from the base unit to the portable unit.

Similar limitations are incorporated in amended claims 10 and 17. For example, the method of amended claim 10 includes, among other steps, preventing power from flowing from a power supply of the base unit to the portable unit during the time when the power outage condition occurs, and supplying the power from the power supply of the base unit to the portable unit when detecting that the power outage condition is no longer occurred. The system recited in amended claim 17 includes, among other things, a means for preventing power from flowing from the power supply of the base unit to the portable unit that is disposed within the cradle when the voltage level of the power supply of the base unit is lower than the predetermined level, and for allowing the power flowing from the power supply of the base unit to the portable unit when the voltage level of the power supply of the base unit is higher than the predetermined level.

New claims 23-25 recites additional limitations that are not taught in any of the references of records.

Son relates to a power supply device for a radio telephone system that can normally perform radio communication during power failure. To do so, when direct current power is not supplied to the radio telephone system due to power failure, the system receives power from a battery disposed at a main body of the system or a wireless handset to an inside circuit of the system.

Son, however, fails to teach or suggest a first means of preventing power from flowing from a power supply of the base unit to the portable unit when the voltage level of the power supply of the base unit is lower than the predetermined level, and a second means for disabling

the first means when the voltage level of the power supply of the base unit is higher than the predetermined level so that the power can flow from the base unit to the portable unit, as recited in amended claim 1 and similarly in amended claims 10 and 17. Furthermore, nowhere in Son has it taught or suggested that the "preventing" feature can be operated manually, as recited in new claims 23-25.

Accordingly, it is believed that claims 1, 10, and 17 are not anticipated over Son under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 10, and 17 are patentable over Son and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 2-9, 11-16, and 18-25 are also patentable at least due to their dependencies from patentable independent claims.

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
Tel: 703/770-7900

Date: November 23, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By:

for

Michael Bednarek
Registration No. 32,329

[Signature] Pott chta
44,615

MB/PCC/CYM/dkp

Customer No. 00909